



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/549,236	04/13/2000	KEVIN W. CARLEY	AND1P405	7816

29838 7590 02/26/2004

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP (ACCENTURE)
PLAZA VII, SUITE 3300
45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1609

EXAMINER

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/549,236

Applicant(s)

CARLEY ET AL. 

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/17/03 has been entered.

Notice to Applicant

2. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 11/17/03 in paper number 14, the following has occurred: Claims 19, 24 and 29 have been amended. Now claims 19-33 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 and 132

3. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and the objection under 35 U.S.C. 132 in previous Office Action have been withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 19, 21, 24, 26, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to

Art Unit: 3626

Edwards et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,883 to Lee et al.

As per claim 19, Buchanan et al. teach a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) (reads on “data loaded into a database”) used to manage document templates as well as storing, retrieving and manipulating data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et al. further teaches that the templates are created and selected by the user (reads on “selecting a data management template”) according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). In addition, Buchanan teaches a document generation system using relational databases that are implemented using a B-tree model and the database manipulation is preformed through program calls to executable functions provided to a program (column 5, lines 52-57).

Buchanan et al. fail to teach a multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;
- (b) receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files;
- (c) receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords;
- (d) selecting a data management template corresponding to the keywords;
- (e) validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity,

Art Unit: 3626

codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met;

(f) loading the validated data into the database; and,

(g) compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template.

Edwards et al. teaches a network verification system including a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not having matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1) or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56) (reads on “validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template; loading the validated data into the database; and, compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template”). The Examiner considers the step of comparing data to included verifying the matched and unmatched data before it is compiled to generated an error report (reads on “generating error and summary reports for a data load”).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the validation of the loaded data as well as the compiling and generating of an error report as taught by Edwards within the computer-assisted document template system with a relational database as taught by Buchanan et al. with the motivation of detecting and preparing a summary report of matched and unmatched data in a database which better informs the user of any discrepancy involved with data being stored in the database.

Art Unit: 3626

Buchanan et al. and Edwards fail to teach a multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;
- (b) receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files;
- (c) receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords; and
- (d) selecting a data management template corresponding to the keywords.

Hobbs teaches a multi-tier client/server model (reads on “a multi-tier client/server architecture”) for record retrieval from a database based on embedded expert judgments linked to words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text entered by the user (reads on “receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords”) (see: column 1, lines 20-42). Hobbs further teaches a client/server system includes a user remoter PC client (200, Fig. 3) connected to front-end communication servers (210, Fig. 3) that run and feed application queries through a database interface (200, Fig. 3) to the designated Data Warehouse (230, Fig. 3) (see: column 14, lines 42 to column 15, lines 27). Furthermore, Hobbs teaches that a client (203, Fig. 4), coupled to the Document Server (202, Fig. 4), including a browser that establishes a connection with the remoter servers (reads on “maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database”) (see: column 15, lines 29-35). In addition, the client (203, Fig. 4) sends requests for information (client requests) to and receives information from the document server

Art Unit: 3626

(202, Fig. 4) (reads on “receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files”) (see: column 15, lines 29-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database using linked words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text as taught by Hobbs with system as taught by Buchanan et al. and Edwards with the motivation of connecting “linked terms” to database records or templates, thereby saving enormous labor and time cost involved in updating a database (see: Hobbs: column 6, lines 55-61).

Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs fail to explicitly teach validating all data loaded into the database matches the data management template by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met.

Lee et al. teaches system and method for creating validation rules to confirm input data using validation rules program (15, Fig. 2) (see: column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 19). Lee et al. further teaches nine comparison templates (481-489, Fig. 11) used to validate, compare and test the contents information entered into a field against one or more predetermined literal values, numeric values, character and alphanumeric strings (see: column 10, lines 19 to column 12, lines 7). The Examiner considers the comparison templates as capable of enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks since the comparison templates test the contents of fields against preset criteria.

Art Unit: 3626

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include validation rules and comparison templates as taught by Lee et al. with the system of Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs with the motivation of using validation rules to test the content of field entered by a user to ensure that field is filled out correctly thereby catching any errors before the user leaves the service site (see: Lee et al.: column 2, lines 32-38).

As per claim 21, Buchanan et al. teaches the claimed user input data files are medical files (see: column 7, lines 37-45 and Fig. 1).

Claim 24 differs from method claim 19 by reciting a “system for generating... “ in the preamble and recitation of logic in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a document generation system using a relational database that are implemented using B-tree model and the database manipulation is performed through program calls to executable functions provided by a program (see: column 5, lines 52-57). The remainder of claim 24 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

As per claims 26 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 21.

Claim 29 differs from method claim 19 by reciting “a computer program embodied on the computer readable medium...” in the preamble and recitation of code segments in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer-assisted system that includes and electronic display (14, Fig. 1), data-processing device (16, Fig. 1) and electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) used for storing information within a relational database (2, Fig. 1) (see: column 4, lines 14-26). The remainder of claim 29 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

Art Unit: 3626

6. Claims 20, 22-23, 25, 27-28, 30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,576 to Dauerer et al.

As per claim 20, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a relational database comprising a series of data structure linked through common fields and the data structures are used to store user responses during document creation (see: column 5, lines 39-52).

Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs fails to teach the claimed no data are loaded into the database if any of the data does not match the data management template.

Dauerer et al. teaches a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: column 14, lines 20-26). Since Dauerer et al. teaches denying access to the system once the detection of invalid or duplicate authorization occurs (see: column 4, lines 47-59). The Examiner considers denying of access once invalid or duplicate authorization occurs to include record invalidation that basically interrupts any further transmission of the records associated with the invalid or mismatched information and prevents the storing of the record into database.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include transmitting of reports including mismatch data as taught Dauerer et al. with

Art Unit: 3626

the system as taught by Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs with the motivation of providing the user with several error report to ensure that inaccurate information is not being loading into the database.

As per claim 22, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed steps of separating data that match the data management template from data that do not match the data management template, and sending the data that do not match the data management template to the user station. This limitation is met by the comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26).

As per claim 23, Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed step of sending a notification upon detecting a concurrently executing load process. This feature is met by the data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26). The Examiner considers the transmission of reports to a remote user as notification to the user of the data that is matched and mismatched as well as the data that is entered and not entered into database.

As per claims 25 and 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

Art Unit: 3626

As per claims 30 and 32-33, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 11/17/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response filed 11/17/03.

(A) In the remarks, Applicants argue in substance that, (1) Buchanan, Edwards and Hobbs fail to teach the amended features of validating data by "enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met"; and (2) Hobbs fails to teach or suggest receiving from a user a plurality of user input data files and receiving user-selected keywords around which the user supplied data files are organized.

(B) In response to the Applicant's arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has applied new prior art to the newly added features of amended claims 19, 24 and 29 at the present time. As such, Applicant's remarks with regard to the application of Buchanan, Edwards and/or Hobbs to the amended claim are moot in light of the inclusion of the teachings of Lee, addressed in the above Office Action.

(C) In response to Applicants arguments that (2) Hobbs fails to teach or suggest receiving from a user a plurality of user input data files and receiving user-selected keywords around which the user supplied data files are organized. The Examiner respectfully submits that the Buchanan et al. and Edwards references, and not Hobbs, *per se*, that was relied upon for the

Art Unit: 3626

specific teaching of a computer-assisted document generation system including templates that are created and selected by the user according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: Buchanan et al.: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). Hobbs was relied for primarily teaching of a multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database based on embedded expert judgments linked to words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text entered by the user (see: Hobbs: column 1, lines 20-42) Thus, the proper combination of the applied references would the incorporation of Hobbs' multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database using linked words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text with system as taught by Buchanan et al. and Edwards.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (703) 605-4441.


The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RWM
rwm


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600